



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/727,282	11/30/2000	Paul C. Dicesare	P-4370	6293

26253 7590 06/17/2003

BECTON, DICKINSON AND COMPANY  
1 BECTON DRIVE  
FRANKLIN LAKES, NJ 07417-1880

EXAMINER
----------

QUAN, ELIZABETH S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1743

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS-13

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/27,282

Applicant(s)

DICESARE ET AL.

Examiner

Elizabeth Quan

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claim 45 recites the limitation "deformable portion" in lines 8 and 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

2. Claims 17-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by EP 1006360 to Miller et al.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Both EP 1006360 and the instant application disclose inventions with the same elements in the claims and specification. The specification and claims of EP 1006360 are similar and directly relevant to the specification and claims of the immediate application, respectively. The first embodiment as depicted in FIGS. 1-6 and the second embodiment as depicted in FIGS. 7-13 of EP 1006360 anticipate the claims in the immediate application. The second embodiment discloses an invention identical to that in the instant application. Specifically, FIGS. 8-13 of EP 1006360 show the invention of the immediate application.

3. Claims 17-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,479,298 to Miller et al.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Both '298 and the instant application disclose inventions with the same elements in the claims and specification. The specification and claims of '298 are similar and directly relevant to the specification and claims of the immediate application, respectively. The first embodiment as depicted in FIGS. 1-6 and the second embodiment as depicted in FIGS. 7-13 of '298 anticipate the claims in the immediate application. The second embodiment discloses an invention identical to that in the instant application. Specifically, FIGS. 8-13 of '298 show the invention of the immediate application.

4. Claims 17-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by 2002/0132367 to Miller et al.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Both 2002/0132367 and the instant application disclose inventions with the same elements in the claims and specification. The specification and claims of 2002/0132367 are similar and directly relevant to the specification and claims of the immediate application, respectively. The first embodiment as depicted in FIGS. 1-6 and the second embodiment as depicted in FIGS. 7-13 of 2002/0132367 anticipate the claims in the immediate application. The second embodiment discloses an invention identical to that

Art Unit: 1743

in the instant application. Specifically, FIGS. 8-13 of 2002/0132367 show the invention of the immediate application.

5. Claims 17-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter.

U.S. Patent No. 6,409,528 to Bodnar discloses and claims the same subject matter as the instant application. In fact, the specification of '528 discloses the same invention as the immediate specification, and the claims are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from that disclosed and claimed in the immediate application. However, the '528 patent, which lists Kenneth J. Bodnar as the sole inventor, and the instant application, which lists Paul Dicesare, Jeffrey Radziunas, Robert Losada, and Fu-Chung Lin as the only inventors, have no common inventors.

### ***Double Patenting***

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 17-23, 25-28, 30-40, 42-46 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 9, 11, 14-16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 33, 35, 38-40, 42, 44, 45, and 48-51 of copending Application No. 10/095337.

Art Unit: 1743

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the elements, including the float, ballast, and bellows, in the claims of the immediate application are present in the claims of Application No. 10/095337. The claims of 10/095337 do not explicitly recite the shape of the ballast, bellows, or sealing section between the upper and lower ends of the bellows. However, the form or shape is an obvious engineering design since it has been held *In re Dailey*, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1976).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant has filed a 1.132 declaration in regard to patent '298. However, the inventorship on patent '298 must be corrected in order for the 1.132 declaration be effective.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. They include one or more limitations in the claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth Quan whose telephone number is (703) 305-1947. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:30).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (703) 308-4037. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 1743

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Elizabeth Quan  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1743

eq  
June 12, 2003

  
Jill Warden  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1700